



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

posuit. Hoc erant utique et ceteri apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio predicti et honoris et potestatis; sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur [et primatus Petro datur ut una Christi ecclesia et cathedra una monstratur. Et pastores sunt omnes, et grex unus ostenditur, qui ab apostolis omnibus unanimi consensione pascitur] ut ecclesia Christi una monstratur. Hanc ecclesiam unitatem qui non tenet, tenere se fidem credit? Qui ecclesie renititur et resistit [qui cathedram Petri, super quam fundata est ecclesia deserit], in ecclesia esse confidit."

It will hence appear that the passage quoted by my opponents consists of interpolations. Gieseler asserts they are not to be found in the oldest MSS. Now, these insertions are the parts on which the Romish claim is based, so far as this passage is concerned. The genuine words show Cyprian's view "of unity" to be as I have represented it. To these sad expedients is the Church of Rome driven in support of her claims. They are the sure but distressing evidences of their conscious untenableness.]

The 3rd passage which you have quoted from Cyprian, ends with the words—"to whom faithfulness cannot have access." The inference which you made hence is this—that, according to the testimony of this writer, the Church of Rome was infallible.

[This is, perhaps, a suitable place for observing, that I had, during this discussion, repeatedly asked for, but could not obtain, references to the extracts and editions of the writers quoted by my opponents. I subsequently both wrote and sent to obtain them, but to no purpose. The reason was, perhaps, this, that the quotations were, I believe, almost wholly made second hand. With respect to the present passage, I had at first understood Mr. Gretton to quote it in reference to Pope Stephen; and, knowing what Cyprian's view of this prelate's conduct was, I requested him to read on, believing that something important was suppressed. I had no books of reference with me during this discussion, and could only rely on my memory. But, having previously noticed an attempt of Cardinal Wiseman's, in his Lectures on the Church, to mislead the public with regard to the opinions of Cyprian, by affirming a doctrine to be his, which he certainly did not hold, and which neither he nor his times had even heard of, I quoted a passage from Cyprian's letter, directly asserting that Pope Stephen was deceived, and, therefore, not infallible. It turned out, however, that Mr. Gretton had quoted from a letter of Cyprian's to Pope Cornelius. The passage is, so far as I know, quite genuine; but the inference made from it completely contradicts Cyprian's own explicit assertion. He never held the Roman See to be preserved by divine Providence from the possibility of being deceived, because he expressly asserts the reverse, in the case of Pope Stephen; and as for his jurisdiction, Cyprian and the North African Church resisted it without hesitation.

Now, with respect to the epistle to Cornelius, if any one will take the trouble of looking at it, he will see that Cyprian as little held the infallibility and jurisdiction of this Pontiff as of the other. The letter is, in part, an *expostulation* with Cornelius for receiving as ambassador of the Carthaginian Bishop, Fortunatus, a person (Felicissimus) who had been excommunicated. He exhorts the Pope to be firm, and not to fear the threats of wicked men; he very clearly intimates that the Pontiff had no right to interfere in the matter. "The cause had been already decided, and judgment already passed where the crime had been committed. The opinions of bishops should not be different. Christ says, let your discourse be yea, yea." The Roman Pontiff was not to alter the judgment already passed by another Church. Hence, it is very certain that Cyprian held not the infallibility, or admitted the supreme jurisdiction of Pope Cornelius. The passage, "to whom perfidy cannot have access," plainly means this—that the Church, whose faith was praised by Paul, should be so mindful of its high character, as, by its foresight and wisdom, to preclude the hope of evil men to deceive by perfidy. That Cyprian did not mean to say more, or, that in point of fact, the Roman See was so secured, is plain; for he expressly says, that perfidy *did* get access, and *did* prevail.]

The last argument you allege from Cyprian is, that "he calls the Church of Rome the root and matrix of the Catholic Church." In any literal sense this is plainly untrue, since other apostolic Churches were founded, so far as we know, before the Church of Rome. The term on which you base your argument was commonly applied to apostolic Churches. And the second Council of Constantinople justly styles the Church of Jerusalem as "the mother of all the Churches in the World."

(To be continued.)

Correspondence.

ON THE INFALLIBLE CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I am able to adduce many more passages from the Holy and Divine Book in support of the infallibility of the Church, but, as you are so fond of brevity, I will only give a few of them in this letter.

On the eve of our Lord's passion, in order to wean His afflicted Apostles from the sensible delights of His presence, of which they were, in a short time, to be deprived, He places before their view the speedy arrival of another

Comforter, and the glorious prerogatives of that pillar of truth, of which they were to be the first supporters. "I will ask the Father," said He, "and he will give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever, the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive."—John xiv. 16, and a portion of verse 17. He then subjoins (v. 26) the nature and end of this divine mission—"The Comforter, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said to you." In the continuation of His address (xvi. 13) the same promise is repeated—"But when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he will teach you all truth."

It is almost trifling with common sense to set about reasoning on these evident testimonies. Christ promises the descent of a Comforter; the promise was fulfilled on Whit-Sunday. He further promises that this Divine Spirit of Truth should abide with them for ever, should teach them all things, and lead them into all truth. Who shall dare to doubt but that this second part of the promise has also been fulfilled in every age since the days of the Apostles? What was the end or nature for which the promise was delivered? To guide the Apostles and their successors for ever into all truth. For has not the Church, in every age, required the perpetual assistance of the Director of Truth, as well as in the Apostolic times? And if it were necessary for them who had imbibed the true faith from the mouth, and in the school of Jesus himself, how much more so must it not be for the faithful in every succeeding age? Therefore, it is clear that the unlimited and unconditional promise of Christ could never become void, whilst the only cause for which it was made still existed in all its force; and hence He has promised that the Spirit of Truth should for ever remain with the Church, conducting her into all truth. That this was His meaning will be further proved from the next Scriptural argument in support of her infallibility, which you shall have next month.

I remain, sir, your humble servant,

WILLIAM ROURKE.

Before any argument can be founded, for the infallibility of the present Church, on the passage from St. John quoted by Mr. Rourke, it is necessary to prove that it is addressed, not to the Apostles merely, but to the Church of every age. Now, let us look at the context. We find our Lord saying—"These things I have spoken unto you, being present with you."—xiv. 25. "The Comforter shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have told you."—xiv. 26. "I go away, and come again to you."—xiv. 29. "I have told you before it came to pass."—xiv. 28. "You have been with me from the beginning."—xv. 27. "These things I have told you, that when the time shall come you may remember that I told you of them. And these things I said not unto you at the beginning, because I was with you."—xvi. 4. "I have many things to say unto you, but you cannot bear them now."—xvi. 12. Is it not evident from all these passages that our Lord was addressing the Apostles themselves, and, in order to comfort them for his approaching departure, promising them the assistance of a Paraclete, whose stay with them should not be temporary, like the sojourn of our Lord on earth, but who should abide with them always? Through the whole passage there is not a syllable said about the successors of the Apostles. If our Lord had meant them, would he not have said so, and, at the same time, told us who they were?

The passage cited by Mr. Rourke, when not cut away from the context, affords an argument *against* the claims of the Church of Rome. Let Mr. Rourke open the passage in his Bible, and he will read as follows:—"If ye love me, keep my commandments, and I will ask my Father, and he shall give ye another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive." When the passage is read thus entire, it shows clearly that Roman Catholics can have no certainty of the decisions of their Church. They cannot conclude, in virtue of this promise, that the Pope is infallible when he declares the doctrines of their Church, unless they can be certain that he fulfils the condition of the promise—namely, to love God, and keep his commandments. Now, Mr. Rourke will not deny that many occupants of the Roman See were men of the world—worldly, wicked, carnal, diabolical men—men who, it is expressly stated here, "cannot receive the spirit of truth." From this very text, then, we conclude that the Church of Rome can have no certainty of the truth of the decrees of such Popes, or of the decisions of councils which have been confirmed by them, and, therefore, the infallibility of the Church which guides herself by such decrees, falls to the ground.

FOURTH COUNCIL OF LATERAN, AND PERSECUTION OF HERETICS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—In the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, for February, 1853, you stated that the Lateran Council decreed that temporal princes should be compelled by the Pope to exterminate heretics from their dominions. I would feel deeply indebted if you would kindly answer such objections to the above as you may have heard stated, such as the denial of Dr. Doyle that it was a decree of

a general council (see examination before House of Lords, April 21, 1825), and the assertion, or rather insinuation, of Milner ("End of Controversy," page 124), that it was only directed against persons who, on account of their crimes, deserved such treatment.

There are several friends of mine who would, I imagine, be led to doubt the infallibility of the Roman Catholic Church if doctrines so contrary to those which Christianity teaches were clearly shown to have been decided upon by an Ecumenical Council.

I would also wish to direct your attention to the statements made by Dr. Dixon, relating to the Apocrypha; they appear to me to be exceedingly absurd; and I consider it would be well if you would devote some of the space in your journal to answering them, as they are put forward by a person of such a high station in the Roman Catholic Church.

Trusting that you will persevere in the good work in which you are engaged,

I remain, Sir,

Yours, sincerely,

A PROTESTANT.

3rd February, 1855.

We thank our correspondent for calling our attention to a very important subject, on which we will endeavour to satisfy him.

We admit that Roman Catholics are excusable, in some cases, for being puzzled to know what are, and what are not, general councils.

Roman Catholics are bound, indeed, by the creed of Pope Pius IV., to believe, as matters of faith, and necessary to salvation, all that the general councils have defined; but their Church has not given them any authorized list of general councils, nor any means of knowing how many general councils there are. On this subject we refer to an article in our number for October, 1853, vol. ii., p. 116.

At the same time, there are some councils which the Church of Rome has declared to be general councils, which no one may venture to deny. The Council of Trent is an instance of this, and so is the Fourth Council of Lateran, which decreed the extermination of heretics. And it has often struck us with astonishment to see the coolness with which some Roman controversialists will deny those very authorities which, by the creed of Pope Pius IV., they are bound to believe, whenever the arguments of Protestants become so strong as to make them ashamed of confessing those authorities before the world.

We will now proceed to show what claims the Fourth Council of Lateran has to be acknowledged as a general council of the Church of Rome; and if any should then say they are not bound to receive its decrees, we ask them to consider what greater obligation they have to believe in the infallibility of the Pope's late decree on the Immaculate Conception.

The Fourth Council of Lateran was summoned by a circular letter of Pope Innocent III. In Labbe and Cossart, vol. xi., 123, we have a copy of the letter sent to the archbishop and bishops of the Province of Vienna. In that letter the Pope says—"Because these things concern the common state of all the faithful, we convoked a GENERAL COUNCIL according to the ancient custom of the holy Fathers."* The letter goes on to state the purposes for which this general council is called—"For extirpating vices and planting virtues, correcting excesses and reforming manners, for rooting out heresies and confirming the faith," &c., &c.† And, for full preparation, two years notice is given, because "a universal council" could not conveniently be gathered quicker.‡ And the Pope thus speaks of the source whence this council originates—"Believing that this salutary proposal descends from Him by whom every best and every perfect gift is given;"§ referring to the Epistle of St. James, ch. i., v. 17.

Then follows a list of those to whom copies of this letter were sent, by which, it appears, that SEVENTY-SIX copies of this letter were sent out, each one directed to the archbishop and bishops of a province.||

Then follows a letter to the Greek Emperor, calling on him to send special ambassadors to the council (col. 126), and a list of twelve other kings of Europe to whom similar letters were sent. Then follow letters to the patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem, also summoning them to a "general council" (col. 128, 130).

So this was clearly a summons for a general council of the Church of Rome.

And the attendance was answerable to the summons. No less than four hundred and twelve bishops, besides eight hundred abbots and priors attended. And Pope Innocent himself presided at the council.

Now, we ask any Roman Catholic to tell us what was wanting here to constitute a general council of the Church of Rome.

Can any one show us a list of general councils in any Roman Catholic author, in which this Fourth Lateran

* Ut quia hæc universorum fidelium communem statum respiciunt, generale concilium juxta præcæptum sanctorum patrum consuetudinem convocemus.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 124.

† Ad extirpanda vitia, et plantandas virtutes, corrigendos excessus, et reformandos mores, eliminandas hæreses, ad roborandam fidem, &c.—Vol. ix., 124.

‡ Quia vero ante biennium, universale non posset concilium commodè congregari.

§ Credentes igitur hoc salutare propositum ab illo descendere, a quo est omne datum optimum, et omne donum perfectum.

|| This whole list is given in Labbe and Cossart, vol. xi., 125, 126.

Council is not reckoned as one? Laurentius Sarius, a very learned man in Roman councils, says—"No one of sound mind can doubt that this Lateran Synod which follows was distinguished among the chief, and truly oecumenical. As being one in which the affairs of religion were treated of with the greatest concord of the Greek and Latin Church, at which were present the patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem, and SEVENTY archbishops, as well Latin as Greek, four hundred and twelve bishops, more than eight hundred abbots and priors—all the prelates, together, TWELVE HUNDRED AND FIFTEEN, or more."* And the canon law itself pronounces this a general council, as we shall see presently.

If this were not a general Roman council, what was?

Now let us see what this council did. They passed 70 canons. The first is—"de fide Catholica"—a confession of faith. The second is the condemnation of the doctrine of the Abbot Joachim. The third, about heretics, &c., &c. All passed by the same authority.

Now, let any Protestant only say, in our pages, that the doctrine of Transubstantiation was never decreed by any general council of the Roman Church before the Council of Trent, and then we should have a host of correspondents exclaiming against such ignorance, and pointing to the first canon of this very Council of Lateran, as the solemn decision of a general council in favour of Transubstantiation. We should admit that Roman Catholics are correct in giving such an answer. But when we then quote the 3rd canon of this very same council, as containing the decision of a Roman general council about heretics, what right have Roman Catholics, then, to turn round on us and say, that it is not a decree of a general council?

We can, however, prove, against them, that it is. We prove it from their own canon law. The Roman canonists of the present century lay it down that, whatever is in the decretals of Pope Gregory IX., is the law of the Church of Rome.†

Now, we turn to those decretals—Lib. v., Tit. vii., c. 13—and there we find this 3rd canon of the fourth Council of Lateran, and we find this heading to it—

"IDEM—viz., INNOCENT III.—IN CONCILIO GENERALI."

Thus the canon law itself declares this very canon to have been passed by a Pope in a general council.

Our readers will now like to see some extracts from this canon—"We excommunicate and anathematize EVERY HERESY which exalts itself against this holy, orthodox, and Catholic faith which we have expounded above; condemning all heretics, by whatever names they may be censured.

Let the secular powers be admonished, and induced, and, if necessary, let them be compelled by ecclesiastical censures, whatever offices they fill, that as they desire to be reputed and counted faithful, they publicly take an oath for the defence of the faith; that in sincerity, to the utmost of their strength, they will apply themselves to exterminate all heretics denounced by the Church.

But if the temporal lord, having been required and warned by the Church, shall have neglected to purge his land from this heretical foulness, let him be bound with the chain of excommunication, by the metropolitan and the other provincial bishops; and if he shall have despised to make satisfaction within a year, let this be signified to the supreme Pontiff, that he (the Pope) may pronounce the vassals (or subjects) thenceforward absolved from their allegiance, and may expose his land to be seized by the Catholics, who shall possess it without any contradiction, the heretics being exterminated, and shall preserve it in purity of faith.‡

There is not one word in the whole canon about civil crimes. It is directed against "every heresy," and "all heretics." It is for "purity of faith," not for civil welfare. It is the Church compelling the civil power, by ecclesiastical censures, to persecute heretics.

Now let us see what Bishop Milner has to say in answer to this.

First, he speaks of the authority by which this decree was passed. "It must first be observed," he says, "who, were present at this council, and by whose authority these decrees of a temporal nature were passed. There were then present, besides the Pope and the bishops, either in person or by their ambassadors, the Greek and the Latin Emperors, the Kings of England, France, Hungary, the Sicilies, Arragon, Cyprus, and Jerusalem; and the representatives of a vast many other principalities and states; so that, in fact, this council was a congress of Christendom,

temporal as well as spiritual."—End of Controversy, letter 49.

Who, on reading this, does not think that this Council of Lateran was quite different in its constitution from the general councils of the Church of Rome—that it was, in fact, more of the nature of a Congress of the princes of Europe to settle the temporal affairs of Europe; and that for infallible decrees of the Church we must rather look to the purely spiritual councils of the Church?

Bishop Milner, it is true, does not say all this; but it was obviously what people would think on reading what he said, and that was just what the crafty bishop wished. The bishop knew as well as we do, that there never was a general council of the Church of Rome to which the princes of Europe were not summoned precisely as they were to this Council of Lateran. He knew that all the princes of Europe (Roman Catholic) were represented in the Council of Trent itself, precisely as they were in this Council of Lateran. But then he hoped that his readers would not know all this, and so wrote in a way that would lead them to think that this Lateran Council was an assembly of a quite different nature from the general councils, which are supposed to speak the sense of the Church. It is an instance of the disingenuous artifice by which this writer is always ready to take advantage of the ignorance of his readers. But such artifices are never used by clever men, except when they are conscious that their cause is bad, and that truth is against them.

And did Bishop Milner really suppose that in the Church of Rome ecclesiastical censures emanate from the princes and not from the bishops?

Second, Bishop Milner says—"The decree of the council regarded only the prevailing heretics of that time." But we have given the very words of the decree above—"Every heresy," "all heretics, by whatever names they may be censured," "all heretics denounced by the Church."

Is there one word here to confine the canon to heretics guilty of crimes? Does it not expressly speak of "ALL heretics?" Is there one word to confine it to the heretics of that time? If that were its meaning, why did Pope Gregory IX., twenty years after, embody it into a code of laws intended for all future ages—a code still held at Rome as being the law of the Church?

The fact is clear. A general council of the Church of Rome, with a Pope at its head, has made a decree in a point of morals, which all Roman Catholics now see was wrong; but they think it still necessary to maintain that a general council, with a Pope at its head, cannot go wrong, either in faith or morals. And so they are driven to every shift and evasion to try and get rid of this decree, against the plainest evidence of its authority and meaning. Let them not be content with such wretched shifts where God's truth and the salvation of their own souls are the things to be sought for. Let them confess that a Pope and a general council have erred against morals in this decree, and then they will be in a position to inquire, like honest men, whether a Pope and a general council have ever erred in a question of faith.

If our correspondent will tell us what work of Dr. Dixon's he refers to, we will attend to it.

ON BRUCIOLI'S BIBLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Permit me to notice, for the benefit of your inquiring Roman Catholic readers, a letter, signed William Murphy, in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, of Jan., 1854, p. 11, wherein the Bible translated by A. Brucioli is offered as evidence that "in every Catholic (Roman) country the circulation of the Scriptures is encouraged." You, sir, have had frequent occasion to complain that Roman Catholics too much rely on second-hand evidence, and on arguments long since refuted; but, perhaps, the enlistment of A. Brucioli's Bible as creditable to the Church of Rome, affords the most notable example. Cardinal Wiseman, twenty years ago, referred to the same Bible, with similar purpose, in his Moorfield lectures, which called forth the admirable "letters" to Dr. Wiseman, by the late Vicar of Blackburn, Dr. Whittaker, wherein he says—"In the account you give of Brucioli's Bible there is not one particle of truth, with the exception of the date of the editio princeps. I am convinced that you never saw the book, and must have taken your account of this distinguished individual on very bad second-hand authority."—p. 175. Dr. Whittaker in proof states that Antonio Brucioli was compelled to fly from Florence, and, with some risk, saved his life, having fallen under the suspicion of heresy. That (according to Dr. McCre, in his "History of the Suppression of the Reformation in Italy," pp. 55, 56) Brucioli's Bible was ranked among prohibited books of the first class in the index of the Council of Trent. The Spanish index, then, before Dr. Whittaker, also holds it in the same class. That Brucioli's Bible was published "con privilegio de lo inculto Senata Veneto," and without any Roman authority whatever. Lastly, that the pictorial illustrations heading the 13th and 17th chapters of the Apocalypse, exhibit respectively a ferocious "beast" and the well-known impure female, described in the text as "madre de la fornicatione," each wearing the triple crown! the papal tiara!

I have myself seen Antonio Brucioli's Bible in Dr. Whittaker's library, and specially examined those boldly executed and instructive wood-cuts. Should Mr. William Murphy and his informant, the Editor of the *Weekly Telegraph*, only view the same, an indulgence which the Dublin libraries could no doubt afford, they will gladly withdraw their statement that "there was another (Italian version) by A. Brucioli (sic) in 1523 (1532), and that is promoted by all means within the command of the Church, of Popes, of cardinals, &c., &c."

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,
EDWARD M. HEARN.

Hurst-green Parsonage,
January 27, 1855.

WHAT DOES ST. PETER SAY ABOUT THE POSES?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I have read with great interest the correspondence of Mr. Rourke in the columns of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, and am happy to congratulate the members of the Roman and Protestant Churches on the auspicious circumstance of the truth being argumentatively contended for by the laity of both communities.

Priestcraft is but the working of ambition in the breasts and minds of unregenerate clergymen, who, excluded from its pursuits in the secular affairs of life, aim at the most fearful despotism that can be exercised over their fellow men, by means of that dark influence which is brought to bear upon spiritual hopes and fears in time and for eternity, and this craft succeeds only in proportion to the people's ignorance of the word of God, and their acceptance of other standards for their faith and practice; the true minister of the Gospel (Mark ix. 33 to 40. Hebrews viii. 1 to 6) does not seek to be a lord over God's heritage; he knows that he has authority in the Church only as it is committed to him, according to the revelations contained in Holy Scripture, and he makes no claim upon belief or submission of the judgment, for which he cannot appeal to the law and to the testimony of his God.

This world is the field in which wheat and tares are growing together till the harvest shall come, and wherever there is a priesthood or a ministry, there lurks in the hearts of the unconverted members of either body that proud spirit that would reign over men upon the earth and attain the glory of its kingdoms. The common safeguard against the most cruel of all tyrannies, lies in our capability of judging the pretensions that are put forth, and examining every ground of authority upon which they are asserted; looking no further than to secondary causes, we can see that it was the exercise of this right of judgment in a limited degree, that led to the comparative independence of the Gallican portion of the Church of Rome, and to the differences that have existed, not only between Jansenists and Jesuits, but between other more nearly accordant brotherhoods in the Papal system; it is the exercise of this right, ever under strictly-imposed limitations, that marks the distinction between the ultramontane and the more reasonable part of the subjects of the Roman see, and keeps alive whatever semblance of spiritual liberty they are either of them permitted to enjoy; it is the exercise of this right which, so far as it is properly carried out in every Church, operates as a check upon the ambition which is in man's fallen nature, whether that nature be clothed in priestly vestments or a layman's garb.

Now, sir, the Church of Rome makes high claims for its priesthood, and asserts that from them, and them only, the laity are to receive the dogmatic teaching of religion. Will Mr. Rourke kindly undertake to prove, for the benefit of every inquiring mind, from the inspired Epistles of St. Peter as his text, and the rest of Scripture for his corroborations—first, that the claims of the Pope and priesthood are right and true; and, secondly, that the dogmas which are exclusively Papal or Roman are in accordance with the sacred writings of the Apostle from whom the hierarchy of his Church claims descent? I ask this favour in all courtesy, and think that if he will accede to my request, he may, under God's blessing, either convince others of what is the truth, or elicit such arguments from you as may lead many to the knowledge of it as it is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

A.

THE ADVANTAGE OF HAVING AN INFALLIBLE GUIDE: IN WHAT DOES IT CONSIST?

SIR—There is nothing the importance of which the Church of Rome dwells more upon than divine faith—by divine faith she means, not what we call a practical living, or sanctifying faith, but a faith which is unwavering, because built upon the testimony of a witness known to be infallible; all else she calls human faith, reasonings, and guesses, and she utterly despises it. Now, there are two questions, to decide which, she maintains the necessity of such an infallible authority. First, is the Bible the Word of God? And, secondly, what is the meaning of its written message? She would enforce upon men this dogma, that their faith, as to these two points, must be built on infallible authority; or else, it is no true faith, nor of any value at all. I will take these two questions separately.

* Labbe & Cossart, vol. xi., p. 238.

† Quidquid legitur in iis comprehenditur, legem facit. Devoti, Jus Canonum. Vol. i., 379. Rome, 1837.

‡ Excommunicamus et anathematizamus, omnem heresim extolentem se adversus hanc sanctam, orthodoxam, Catholicam fidem, quam superius exposuimus, condemnantes universos hereticos, quibuscumque nominibus censeantur. . . . Moneantur autem, et inducantur, et si necesse fuerit, per censuram ecclesiasticam compellantur seculares potestates, quibuscumque fungantur officiis, ut sicut reputari cupiant et haberi fideles, ita pro defensione fidei præstent publicum juramentum, quod de terris sue jurisdictionis subjectis universos hereticos ab ecclesia denotatos bona fide pro viribus exterminare studebunt. . . . Si vero Dominus temporalis requisitus et monitus ab ecclesia, terram suam purgare neglexerit ab hac heretica feditate, per metropolitanum et ceteros comprovinciales episcopos excommunicationis vinculo innodetur. Et si satisfecere contempserit infra annum, significetur hoc summo Pontifici; ut ex tunc ipse vassallos ab ejus fedelitate denunciet absolutos, et terram exponat Catholicis occupandam, qui eam, exterminatis hereticis, sine ulla contradictione possideant, et in fidei puritate conservent. . . .

—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 148.